

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE 12

THE PROGRESSIVE  
April 1981

# Moles

Jeffrey Stein

The chill wind blowing in Washington did not begin with Ronald Reagan's inauguration. There was an early blast about two years ago, when right-wing scholars and journalists, affiliated for the most part with the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies, began peddling the notion that the Government was infested with "moles"—American officials recruited long ago by Soviet intelligence.

The talk of "moles" in the Government has simmered down since Reagan entered the White House, but there is reason for concern about a possible recrudescence of McCarthyism. Reagan transition officials said they would take "a close look" at recommendations by the right-wing Heritage Foundation to investigate "subversives," and the Senate reestablished an Internal Security and Terrorism Subcommittee.

"Terrorism" is the key word, of course: It has replaced "communism" as the all-purpose menace which provides the rationale for political repression. A recent piece by syndicated columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak illustrated the new shape being given to the old theme of red-baiting. A look at it also allows us to feel what it's like to be on the short end of a witchhunt.

Stephen R. Weissman spent the first weekend of February worrying. He is a quiet, carefully articulate political scientist, thirty-nine years old, with a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago.

*Jeffrey Stein is The Progressive's contributing editor in Washington.*

For two years he worked under Democratic Representative Stephen Solarz on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, specializing in U.S. policy toward Africa.

During those years, the Commit-

tee had backed the Carter Administration's sanctions against Rhodesia until a peaceful transition to majority rule was accomplished, had developed legislation prohibiting the CIA from engaging in another secret war in Angola; and had generally looked for ways to carry out a humane and progressive foreign policy divorced from past entanglements with the white supremacists in South Africa.

Late in January, Stephen Weissman received a call from columnist Evans, who inquired about two matters: First, an article by Weissman, "The CIA and U.S. Policy in Zaire and Angola," that had been reprinted in a book called *Dirty Work (II)*, issued by an anti-CIA group in Washington affiliated with former CIA agent and critic Phillip Agee; second, some remarks critical of Zaire that Weissman had made at an academic conference in Philadelphia.

Weissman seemed polite, and Weissman explained. First, he said, his article had originally been written expressly for, and printed in, a book of scholarly articles on Southern Africa. It had later been reprinted in the August *Political Science Quarterly*. He had given the editors of *Dirty Work (II)* permission to reprint the piece, as had other authors from the Defense Department and *The New York Times*. Weissman also explained that he had complained to the editors of *Dirty Work (II)* when he found out too late that their book would include an appendix listing the names of hundreds of CIA agents.

As to his remarks at the Philadelphia conference, Weissman told Evans, he had clearly spoken for him.



Mike Konopacki

CONTINUED